REMARKS

Claims 1, 13 - 14, 20, 26, and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 14, 20, 26, and 35 remain in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment/Response is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, and claim amendments and cancellations made in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as previously presented and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants submitted an Information Disclosure Statement on June 6, 2007, and a copy thereof is attached to the present Office Action dated August 22, 2007 (hereinafter, "the Office Action"). However, a cited reference has not been initialed therein, namely the reference titled "The Automated Design and Code Writing System ...". Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider this reference if not already considered, and so signify by initialing the Information Disclosure Statement.

II. Rejections under 35 U. S. C. §102(b)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 15, 20, 26, 29 - 30, and 35 [sic] are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript" (hereinafter, "Lemay"). Applicants respectfully note that Claims 15 and 29 - 30 were previously cancelled. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the claims as currently presented.

Independent Claim 1, as currently presented, specifies "each of at least two of the at least three alternative selectable versions has a different media type" (Claim 1, lines 9 - 10, emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to teach, or suggest, this claim limitation from independent Claim 1. Lemay's example is repeatedly displaying ".gif" files – that is, files with the same media type. (See, for example, the "rotate" function, line beginning with "document.images[0].src" and the <IMG> tag in the <BODY>.) This is different from Applicants' claimed approach as recited on lines 9 - 10 of Claim 1.

As stated by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, "Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention." *Apple Computer Inc. v. Articulate Sys. Inc.,* 57 U.S.P.Q.2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000), emphasis added. In another case, the Court of Appeals held that a finding of

anticipation requires absolute identity for each and every element set forth in the claimed invention. See *Trintec Indus. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.,* 63 U.S.P.Q.2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Because Lemay fails to disclose "each of at least two of the at least three alternative selectable versions has a different media type" (Claim 1, lines 9 - 10, emphasis added), the Office Action has not cited a single piece of prior art that discloses each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Lemay does not anticipate Applicants' Claim 1 according to the holding from *Apple Computer Inc.* And, because Lemay discloses use of a single media type whereas Applicants have claimed "each of at least two of the at least three alternative selectable versions has a different media type" (Claim 1, lines 9 - 10, emphasis added), the Office Action has not cited prior art that provides absolute identity for each and every element set forth in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Lemay does not anticipate Applicants' Claim 1 according to the holding from *Trintec Indus.*

Independent Claims 26 and 35 recite analogous limitations to those of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that their independent Claims 1, 26, and 35 are patentable over the reference. Dependent Claims 7 - 10, 13 - 14, and 20 are deemed patentable by virtue of (*inter alia*) the allowability of the independent claim from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection of all

claims as currently presented.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168
Phone: 407-343-7586
Fax: 407-343-7587